



Transportation Performance Audit Board
Review of Performance and Outcome
Measures of the Washington
State Department of Licensing's
Transportation-Related Programs

Volume 3
Use of Performance
Benchmarks in Other States

SMG/Columbia Consulting Group

Final Report

December 17, 2004

Transportation Performance Audit Board
Review of Performance and Outcome Measures
of the Washington Department of Licensing's
Transportation-Related Programs

Volume 3
Use of Performance Benchmarks in Other States

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION & METHODOLOGY	3-1
I.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE SURVEY	3-1
I.2 DEFINITIONS.....	3-1
I.3 PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.....	3-2
I.4 SURVEY METHODOLOGY	3-2
II. ANSWERS TO THE TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT BOARD'S QUESTIONS	3-4
III. SURVEY RESULTS, BY AGENCY	3-16
III.1 MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE	3-16
III.2 TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF SAFETY	3-18
III.3 VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES	3-22
 APPENDIX 3A – DOCUMENTS, INFORMATION SOURCES, AND INTERVIEWEES	
APPENDIX 3B – INTERVIEW GUIDES AND SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS	
APPENDIX 3C – SURVEY CANDIDATE EVALUATION CRITERIA	
APPENDIX 3D – SUMMARY OF OVERSIGHT MEASURES USED BY AGENCIES	
APPENDIX 3E – MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE OVERSIGHT MEASURES	
APPENDIX 3F – TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF SAFETY OVERSIGHT MEASURES	
APPENDIX 3G – VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES OVERSIGHT MEASURES	
APPENDIX 3H – WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING TRANSPORTATION-RELATED OVERSIGHT MEASURES	

I. Introduction & Methodology

- This is the third volume in SMG/Columbia Consulting Group's review of the Washington Department of Licensing (DOL)'s transportation-related performance and outcome measures for the Transportation Performance Audit Board (TPAB).
- For this part of the review, SMG was asked to select three similar state vehicle/driver licensing agencies where performance benchmarks have been used by management to improve agency performance.
- We contacted these agencies to understand how they use performance measures and benchmarks.
- This report describes our survey methodology, answers questions asked by the TPAB in its Request for Proposals, and presents survey findings by agency.

I.1 Objectives of the Survey

- We designed our survey so that we could answer three questions:
 - What performance benchmarks have been used in other states to measure the performance of similar programs in similar agencies?
 - How do benchmarks used in other states compare with those used by the Washington DOL?
 - What "best practices" can be found in other agencies with respect to use of performance measures, benchmarks, strategic planning and performance management?
- The survey focused on the types of performance measures and benchmarks that agencies monitor and how they are created, used, and reported.
- This survey was not a traditional "benchmarking" study; that is, it did not attempt to analyze business processes and related measures in such a way that would allow us to collect and compare specific performance data between states. We did identify and describe benchmarking activities that are taking place within survey agencies.

I.2 Definitions

- A **performance measure** is a measure that describes how an organization functions, operates or behaves. Performance measures describe the outputs, efficiency, effectiveness, timeliness and outcomes of specific processes and services. They can also be used create an overall picture of an organization, examining it from financial, customer, process, and learning and growth perspectives.¹
- An **outcome measure** is a specific type of performance measure that monitors the change in or benefits to customers that directly result from a particular product or service.

¹ Adapted from Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB) guidelines and concepts presented in "The Balanced Scorecard – Measures that Drive Performance" by Robert S. Kaplan and David P. Norton, Harvard Business Review #92105, January-February 1992.

- A **benchmark** is a measurement of performance against a specific reference point. Our survey asked agencies to tell us whether or not a benchmark, baseline value, or reference point had been established for each measure. We will use the terms “benchmark” and “baseline” interchangeably in this report.
- A **target** is a desired level of performance to be achieved within a specific period of time. Our survey asked agencies to tell us whether targets were established for each measure and if so, what kinds of targets were used.
- **Benchmarking** refers to the practice of comparing the performance of an agency to that of similar agencies with similar work processes.

1.3 Participating Agencies

- We contacted three agencies to complete this survey:
 - Missouri Department of Revenue, Division of Motor Vehicle and Drivers Licensing (Missouri DOR)
 - Tennessee Department of Safety, Motor Vehicle Services (Tennessee DOS)
 - Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles (Virginia DMV)
- In addition, we examined published information about performance management and measures for the following agencies:
 - Virginia Motor Vehicle Dealer Board (Virginia MVDB)
 - Maryland Department of Transportation, Motor Vehicles Administration (Maryland DOT)
 - Minnesota /Department of Public Safety, Driver and Vehicle Services Division (Minnesota DPS)
 - Arizona Department of Transportation, Motor Vehicles Division (Arizona MVD)

1.4 Survey Methodology

Step 1 - Select survey candidates.

- SMG asked the Director, Assistant Directors, and other managers of the DOL for suggestions of driver and vehicle licensing agencies that they considered to be peers or leaders in service delivery and/or performance management.
- SMG expanded this list by adding any agencies that were similar to Washington DOL in terms of the total number of licensed drivers statewide or the total number of Certificates of Title issued annually.
- Eleven state agencies were then evaluated for inclusion in the study using criteria and data that are summarized in Appendix 3C. Our three study candidates were selected because:
 - They are part of state governments that were rated as being effective in the use of performance measurement by Governing Magazine’s article “Grading the States 2001”, and published sources suggested that the candidates were using performance measures/benchmarks.

- They are similar in organization and service delivery to Washington DOL. Even though there are no two agencies nationwide that deliver services in exactly the same way, there are some important similarities between the study candidates and DOL. In all cases, a single department has responsibility for both drivers and vehicle services. Like DOL, Tennessee DOS delivers drivers and vehicle services in separate physical locations. (Missouri DOR and Virginia DMV co-locate most services, however.) Also like DOL, candidates have privatized (or used county agents for) some or all vehicle transactions.
- They encourage use of the Internet to complete key transactions. Tennessee DOS and Virginia DMV allow on-line drivers license renewals, and Missouri DOR and Virginia DMV allow on-line registration renewals. This was important to ensure that we considered performance measures that are unique to the Internet service delivery model.

Step 2 - Establish agency contacts.

- The Director of the DOL sent out an introductory e-mail to our candidate agencies requesting their participation and contact information.
- SMG contacted each agency by e-mail and telephone to explain the purpose of study and to arrange for completion of the survey.

Step 3 - Conduct survey.

- SMG interviewed each of the agency contacts by telephone (see the Interview Guide in Appendix 3B) to understand:
 - Agency organization, including confirming organizational details and structure of information services within the agency.
 - General use of strategic planning/performance measurement and oversight/reporting activities.
 - Use of performance measures/benchmarks.
 - Benchmarking or comparisons with other agencies that may be occurring.
- We sent a survey (by e-mail) to agency contacts requesting specific information about oversight and operational measures, including benchmarks/baselines and targets used.
- We collected published information about each agency and any statewide strategic planning, performance management, or benchmarking initiatives or guidelines.
- Agencies were contacted by phone and e-mail to follow-up on survey details and published information.

II. Answers to the Transportation Performance Audit Board's Questions

In this section we will answer the questions about performance benchmarks that the Transportation Performance Audit Board (TPAB) posed in its Request for Proposals.

1. What performance benchmarks have been used in other states to measure the performance of similar programs in similar agencies? How are benchmarks used?

Overview of Performance Measures/Benchmarks and Their Use

- Most of the performance measures that are formally and routinely monitored by the three survey agencies are used for oversight.
 - **Oversight measures** are those that are reported to the Governor, Legislature, other oversight agencies, or the public on a regular basis.
 - These measures generally appear in a strategic plan, budget document, agency annual report, or similar published document and are made available on agency or state web sites.
- None of the survey agencies submitted a complete set of **operating measures**, or measures that are used for the internal monitoring and management of the agency.² Representatives from the Missouri DOR and Virginia DMV indicated that they have no formal operating measures that are separate and distinct from the oversight measures. Tennessee DOS provided examples of formal operating measures that they use. (While we know that agencies use measures and data for managing day-to-day operations, it was outside of the scope of this review to evaluate or describe informal measurement activity.)
- Each of the oversight measures reported by survey agencies includes a **benchmark** or baseline value that is used as a reference point for comparison to current performance. These baseline values were developed by:
 - Using an average of historical data to set a baseline,
 - Establishing the most recent time period's performance as the baseline, or
 - Identifying a desired level of performance that must be maintained. (The value was created by agency management, or was based on an industry standard.)
- Most measures also include **targets**, or a desired level of performance to be reached within a specific period of time. Three kinds of targets were identified in the survey:
 - A "stretch" target is one that is desirable but challenging to achieve. It may or may not be achieved in the near term
 - A "budget" target is one that is projected to be achievable, given recent performance data or current resources.
 - In some cases, agencies set targets that are equal to benchmarks or baselines, contending that they would manage performance to remain the same over time.

² Virginia DMV did submit one "operating" measure. It is included in Appendix 3G.

(For example, customer wait time is often managed to a set number of minutes. Agencies certainly do not want the wait to exceed the baseline minutes, but there may be no real advantage to reducing the wait below this baseline.)

- The number of measures used for oversight purposes varies from 4 (Virginia DMV) to 49 (Missouri DOR).

Measures Reported by Survey Agencies, By Type

Exhibit V3-a summarizes the types of measures that are reported to oversight organizations by the survey or literature review agencies. (Washington DOL is included for comparison. DOL's use of oversight measures will be discussed in the answer to the next question.)

Exhibit V3-a
Performance Measures, by Type, Included in Each Agency's Oversight Reports

Performance Measure Type	State Agency						
	Missouri DOR	Tennessee DOS	Virginia DMV	Maryland DOT	Minnesota DPS	Arizona MVD	Washington DOL
Workload	X	X	X	X	X		X
Revenue Generation/Budget	X		X		X	X	X
Customer Service	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Image/Reputation			X	X		X	
Social Outcomes			X				X
Efficiency	X	X	X		X	X	X
Effectiveness	X	X					X
Timeliness	X	X			X	X	X
Employee Development			X				X
Technology Development			X				X
Culture Development			X				X

To better understand the breadth of measures reported for oversight purposes, we classified each measure by type. Types of measures include:

- **Workload** – Workload measures describe the volume of products or services produced by an organization. While output and workload measures are not true measures of “performance” per se, they are valuable for establishing the scope of work and monitoring trends in product or service demand.

Most agencies include workload measures in their oversight reporting. Examples that they report include:

- Number of motor vehicle registrations produced
- Total number of dealerships licensed
- Number of telephone calls received
- Number of Internet transactions completed

- **Revenue Generation & Budget**– These measures are “big picture” measures that focus on the ability of the organization to effectively generate revenue and operate within budget. In government organizations, they typically focus on revenue generated per specific process output, such as revenue per license issued and budget expenditures relative to allotments.

Three agencies report some form of revenue measures (Missouri DOR reports four) and no agencies appear to report budget measures as part of their oversight packages. (Virginia DMV reports budget and revenue measures to oversight agencies through channels other than “Virginia Results”. We did not review or summarize these.)

Measures include:

- Ratio of dollars collected for every dollar spent on fuel tax evasion enforcement
- Fuel tax revenue generated, before refunds
- Driver-related revenue generated (initial and renewal)
- Registration revenue generated
- Title revenue generated

- **Customer Service Attributes** – These measures are focused on the attributes of services or products that are most important to the customers that receive the service. Typically, these measures fall into one of four categories: price, quality, timeliness, and/or functionality.

All agencies report some form of customer service measure. Examples include:

- Average wait time, from arrival to assistance at counter
- Percent of customers completing their transactions during the first visit to a field office
- Percent of time that drivers license renewal notifications are mailed on time
- Cost to the customer (in time and money) to renew a registration
- Percent of customer e-mails that are processed/responded to within five business days

- **Image/Reputation** – These are measures of the attitude of customers toward the organization. They are not “factual” measures, but instead tend to measure customer perception. These measures can address direct customers or indirect customers (the public at large, the legislature, government agencies, for example).

The most common measures in this category usually come from customer survey information. Our survey revealed that several agencies have measures of overall “customer satisfaction” or customer perception, including:

- Customer satisfaction with services, as measured by a survey
 - Percent of customers rating facility appearance as Good or Very Good
 - Percent of customers rating employee helpfulness as Good or Very Good
- **Social Outcomes** – These are measures of the “greater good” that the agency delivers to the public at large. Only Virginia DMV includes a social outcome measure among its oversight measures. (Some agencies report social outcomes in strategic plans or annual reports but do not identify them as being part of their official oversight measures.)

Examples of this measure include:

- Total reduction in the number of highway fatalities related to alcohol use and lack of seatbelt use
 - Reduction in the number of traffic fatalities
- **Efficiency** – These measures evaluate the cost of providing a unit of service to a customer. Most agencies report some form of efficiency measure, including:
- The agency’s cost to produce a drivers license
 - Cost per customer served
 - Cost to produce a renewal license
 - Percent of court records received electronically
- **Effectiveness** – These measures look at the overall quality of a process. Missouri DOR and Tennessee DOS report this type of measure. Examples include:
- Percentage of drivers licenses produced correctly on the first attempt
 - DUI dismissal rate
 - Percent of registrations produced correctly (without errors)
 - Percent of fuel tax returns without errors
- **Timeliness.** These measures describe the timeliness of the performance of a process or completion of a product. Process timeliness is important if it contributes to something that the customer cares about, to the revenue generation ability or productivity of the organization, or to the ability of the organization to comply with laws or regulations. (Some timeliness measures are extremely important to the customer, and appear in the Customer Service measure category.)

Examples of timeliness measures reported by agencies include:

- Average number of days to complete record updates
- Total average days to process DUI-related hearings
- Number of days from receipt of fuel tax to deposit
- Processing time for issuance of a drivers license

Only Virginia DMV, through its “Management Scorecard”, uses any of the following types of measures for oversight purposes:³

- **Employee Development.** These are measures of the effectiveness of investments in the organization’s employees, typically relating to their growth or functioning. An example might be a measure of training effectiveness.
- **Technology Development.** These measures typically address the effectiveness of the organization in making investments in technology that, in the intermediate to long term, will significantly contribute to the performance of the organization. An example of a measure in this category might be the competency of employees to use a newly introduced or enhanced information system. Another measure might be progress made by the organization in implementing its strategic information systems plan.
- **Culture Development.** These are measures that assess the effectiveness of investments in the culture of the organization. Examples of measures might include the percent of employees that are fully aware an agency’s vision, mission or strategies or measures of organizational morale.

Discussion of Selected Measures Reported

Exhibit V3-b describes a few of the performance measures reported in more detail. (Washington DOL is included for comparison. DOL’s use of these measures will be discussed in the answer to the next question.)

Exhibit V3-b
Selected Performance Measures Included in Each Agency’s Oversight Reports

Performance Measure	Where Reported, by State Agency						
	Missouri DOR	Tennessee DOS	Virginia DMV	Maryland DOT	Minnesota DPS	Arizona MVD	Washington DOL
Wait time	X	X	X		X	X	X
Customer satisfaction (as measured by survey)			X	X		X	
Use of alternate service delivery (Internet, IVR, mail, other self-service)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

³ The Management Scorecard rates the Virginia DMV’s overall effectiveness in categories such as Human Resources Management and Technology, for example. For descriptions of these categories, see Appendix 3G.

Performance Measure	Where Reported, by State Agency						
	Missouri DOR	Tennessee DOS	Virginia DMV	Maryland DOT	Minnesota DPS	Arizona MVD	Washington DOL
Cost per customer (various transactions or overall)	X		X				
Call center (various)		X		X		X	X
Information technology (various)	X						X

- **Wait time** – All agencies measure and report some version of customer wait time. Definitions of this measure vary:
 - Missouri DOR and Virginia DMV measure time from arrival in the office to assistance at the counter. These are generally average customer waits (in minutes) for all offices over a given time period. Data are made possible by use of a Q-Matic or similar wait time automated system. (Washington DOL also uses this type of measure.)
 - Tennessee DOS is in the process of acquiring and implementing a new wait time system. Currently, the agency can only measure the time it takes to issue a license after the customer reaches the counter and the examiner/field agent pulls the customer's record.
- **Customer satisfaction** – Only Virginia DMV and Maryland DOT report customer satisfaction (as measured by a routine survey of customers) as part of their oversight measures. (Other agencies use measures that describe customer service attributes, but not satisfaction per se.)
- **Use of alternate service delivery** – Delivery of services to customers using alternates to face-to-face contact is increasingly important to motor vehicle and driver licensing agencies. Each of the agencies reports some measure for use of alternate service delivery (the Internet, Interactive Voice Response, mail, other self-service). Measures fall into three categories:
 - Workload/number of transactions processed
 - Number of services provided through alternate means
 - Percent of total transactions that are conducted through alternate means. (This measure allows agencies to examine the shift in type of service delivery over time.)
- **Cost per customer** – This measure is reported by two survey agencies:
 - Virginia DMV reports the dollar cost per customer served by all of its programs.
 - Missouri DOR calculates the cost to customers in both customer time and fees to complete key transactions, including obtaining an initial drivers license, obtaining a renewal license, registering a vehicle, and obtaining a title.

- **Call center measures (various)** – Tennessee DOS, Maryland DOT and Arizona MVD report call handling performance as part of oversight measures. (Virginia DMV collects a full range of call center data, but does not have specific oversight measures related to call center performance.) Not all agencies have call centers, but those that do generally have access to a full variety of management data. Measures reported include:
 - Percent of incoming calls that are answered (do not receive a busy signal) – Maryland
 - Percent of calls abandoned or are abandoned to an operator – Tennessee DOS
 - Percent of customers rating call center performance as good or very good – Maryland DOT
 - Average telephone wait time – Arizona MVD
 - Time on hold – Virginia DMV (this is not an oversight measure, but is a formal operating measure)
- **Information technology measures (various)** – Missouri DOR reports several measures under the umbrella of its Information Technology function. While they do not address the overall effectiveness of the agency's investment in technology they do describe the nuts and bolts of providing information technology support to motor vehicle services agencies. Measures include:
 - Percent of time network is available
 - Percent of customers indicating satisfaction with web site
 - Number of homepage hits
 - Number of e-mails received

A complete summary of oversight performance measures and reporting by agency appears in 3D. Details about performance measures, benchmarks/baselines and targets for each of the three survey agencies appear in Appendices 3E, 3F, and 3G.

Use of Benchmarking or Comparative Analysis

- **Benchmarking** refers to the practice of comparing the performance of an agency to that of similar agencies with similar work processes.
- The Missouri DOR regularly compares its performance to that of other agencies:
 - The Missouri DOR's 2005 Strategic Plan includes comparisons of measure benchmarks/baselines to baselines from up to three peer states. These data are compiled from the agency's annual survey of American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA) members. Each year, Missouri DOR conducts this survey by describing its measures and calculations and requesting comparable information.
 - Each product owner selects benchmarking peers or partners that are appropriate for his/her measures.
- The Virginia DMV is undertaking a project to include at least six states in a benchmarking study. The study, to be conducted by a consultant, will assist participating agencies to identify common measures and to collect and compare data on an ongoing basis.

- The Tennessee DOS does not formally compare its measures with peer agencies. The DOS periodically compares its performance with Internet-published data sources.

2. How do these benchmarks (and benchmarking processes) compare with those used by DOL?

Measures and Benchmarks/Baselines Reported

- Unlike the survey agencies, DOL has not yet identified a discrete list of performance measures that it uses for most oversight purposes. Consequently we had to make assumptions about which measures are considered to be oversight and which are operating measures. We assumed that relevant transportation-related measures reported in the following qualify as oversight measures:
 - The Agency Activity Inventory, Statewide Report for Agency 240 Department of Licensing
 - The Governor's Performance Agreement with the Director of the Department of Licensing
- From these documents, we identified 73 measures that could qualify as DOL's "oversight" measures. While there are several measures in most of the major categories (see Exhibit IIa), nearly half of all DOL's oversight measures are **workload measures**. These describe the volume of products or services produced by the agency rather than its true performance. (A complete list of DOL's oversight measures appears in Appendix 3H.)
- The Governor's Performance Agreement includes a number of project-oriented objectives, or things that must be done in order for the DOL to be considered successful. In some cases a performance measure for the objective was identified or implied, in other cases there was no measure. Some examples of these objectives include:
 - Migrate 35 software applications and data.... to an enterprise technology architecture server environment by June 2005. A measure of the success of reaching this objective is "Percent of Vehicle code that has been delivered from the vendor for testing by DOL."
 - Re-negotiate Tribal Fuel Tax Agreements. A measure for this objective is "Number of agreements re-negotiated."
 - Implement alternative methods to renew driver licenses/ID cards. (No measure was identified in the Performance Agreement.)
- We did not find measures describing project-oriented objectives in our survey agencies' oversight measures. There are several possible reasons for this:
 - Each survey agency's oversight measures have been selected to be stable over time. Process-oriented objectives may vary from year, depending on completion status, resources or changes in agency strategy.
 - We did not review performance agreements between agency directors and the Governor in these states, since oversight measures were clearly identified in other places. These documents would likely include project-oriented objectives.
- As indicated in Exhibit V3-a, DOL's oversight measures include most of the major measure types:

- Nearly half (30 of 73) of the measures reported are workload measures.
 - DOL and Virginia DMV were the only agencies to include any kind of social outcome measure in oversight reports. DOL reports the following:
 - Reduce the number of truck-related fatalities by 41 percent by 2008
 - Reduction in the NHTSA fatality rate per 100 million vehicle miles traveled
 - As is fitting for an agency with “Collect and administer revenue” as a primary objective, 19 measures are related to revenue generation. This is significantly more than found in other agencies. Many are phrased as revenue objectives rather than measures. Measures (objectives) include for example:
 - Collect approximately \$1.9 billion in fuel taxes per biennium.
 - Collect \$708 million for the Motor Vehicle fund.
 - Collect \$43.8 million in Washington commercial vehicle registration fees
- Like its peers, DOL measures the following:
- **Wait time** – Use of the Q-Matic system allows DOL to measure time from arrival in the office to assistance at the counter.
 - **Use of alternate service delivery** – DOL reports on the number of Internet transactions performed, number of users of Internet services, and number of internet services provided. More importantly, DOL is examining the movement from traditional to alternate service delivery by measuring the percent increase in the number of Internet transactions completed.
 - **Cost per customer** – DOL is required to submit a Fee Study for Driver and Vehicle Services to the Legislature every two years. The study includes expenditures per program and identifies the costs (in fees) that customers must pay for each transaction. The DOL collects anecdotal information about time customer time savings related to use of subagents for vehicle transactions, but is not currently able to provide the same level of cost per customer (time and fees) that Missouri DOR reports.
 - **Call center measures** - Like its peer, DOL reports several measures relating to its call center, including number of busy calls, number of abandoned calls, calls handled per FTE position, and number of self-service calls.
 - **Information technology measures** – DOL reports measures that describe the status of various information technology projects in its oversight measures.
- DOL does not include any measures of **customer satisfaction** in its oversight measures. (The agency does complete customer satisfaction surveys and collects information from customer comment cards in all locations, but the results are not routinely reported in the oversight reports.)

Benchmarks/Baselines and Targets

- Many of DOL’s measures clearly identify a specific performance target. (For example, “Conduct a DUI hearing within 60 days of the incident.”) It is not clear if these measures also have a separate benchmark or baseline. In some cases, the benchmark is equal to the target.

- The DOL is in the early stages of identifying benchmarks for its operating measures. These are being established in much the same way that survey agencies create them, using average historical data, a recent time period's performance, industry standards, executive directions, or federal mandates.
- A more complete discussion of the construction of specific measures and their associated benchmarks/baselines and targets appear in Volume 4.

General Comparison of DOL's Performance Management to Survey Agencies

- The DOL's overall use of performance measures/benchmarks is under development. As such, DOL's use of oversight measures understandably lags that of the agencies with more mature processes:
 - Missouri DOR features the most sophisticated use of oversight performance measures and benchmarks of the three agencies we surveyed. Measures, benchmarks/baselines, targets, and current performance are Internet accessible. Measures represent a strong cross-section of categories, and Missouri is actively describing the cost of its services to its customers (time and money). The agency is routinely comparing its performance with others.
 - Tennessee DOS also provides measures, benchmark/baselines, and actual performance on the Internet, through its easy to read Strategic Plan.
 - Like DOL, Virginia DMV is in transition. The agency has scrapped its use of a performance scorecard for internal management in hopes of identifying appropriate performance measures during the upcoming benchmarking project. Unlike DOL, Virginia DMV has a history of reporting performance against key oversight measures, and includes benchmarks/baselines and targets for each measure. Performance against key measures is available back to 1996, in most cases.

4. What "best practices" can be found in other agencies with respect to strategic planning and performance management?

- A common link between the three state agencies we surveyed is that there is strong outside motivation for measurement. Performance measurement is required for strategic planning and budgeting (Missouri DOR, Tennessee DOS) or for oversight reporting (Virginia DMV).
 - The Tennessee Government Accountability Act requires agencies to develop outcome-oriented and time-bound measures, to be submitted and approved with the Department's budget request. Once measures are approved, they may not be changed until the next appropriations cycle unless there are changes in operations that result from court action, law, executive order or changes in federal funding.
 - Missouri passed legislation two years ago requiring performance measures to be included in agency budgets. Budget measures include measures of efficiency, effectiveness, number of clients/individuals served, and customer satisfaction.
 - Virginia HB 2097, passed in 2003, created the Government Performance and Results Act, which requires state agencies to develop strategic plans and

performance measures that enhance agency efficiency and effectiveness and support the objectives of the Governor and Council.

- Our three survey agencies share some important characteristics:
 - Survey agencies recognize the importance of planning and performance measurement. Missouri DOR, for example, has made strategic planning and performance measurement part of its culture.
 - Oversight measures are clearly identified. There is no speculation about which ones are really oversight versus other kinds of measures. This is true even if some of the key operating measures are used as oversight measures, as is the case with the Tennessee DOS.
 - The oversight performance measures are stable over time, so that actual performance against benchmarks and targets can be tracked and compared.
 - There is a process for replacing or adjusting measures, benchmarks, and targets so that these are not changed arbitrarily.
 - Measures and performance are published on agency and/or state web sites. The best are easy to find and use by oversight agencies and the general public.
 - Measures are linked to strategic plans and budgets (in Missouri DOR and Tennessee DOS). The same measures can be found in each oversight document, so there is little or no confusion about the measurements or their objectives.

Missouri Excellent Practices

- The Missouri DOR's three most recent Strategic Plans and performance measures are published on the "Missouri Managing for Results" web site.
- Measures included in the budget are a subset of the measures reported in the Strategic Plan. All but three of the 16 budget measures are also strategic plan measures. This provides for strong linkages between the strategic plan, budget and performance measures and benchmarks.
- For each measure, Missouri DOR's strategic plan clearly identifies the name of the measure, a baseline result, an actual result, comparative data from other agencies (if available) and targets for future performance. The plan identifies activities or events that could impact targeted performance and strategies that are directly related to the measure.

Tennessee Excellent Practices

- The most recent Tennessee DOS strategic plan, annual report and agency budget and all related performance measures, benchmarks/baselines and targets are available on-line.
- Tennessee DOS produces an "At-a-Glance" summary of goals, performance standards and performance measures. The document presents key measures by goal, targets, and explains why each measure and corresponding target was selected.

Virginia Excellent Practices

- Performance measures for all state agencies, including the Virginia DMV, are published on the "Virginia Results" website at www.dpb.state.va.us/VAResults/Index.cfm.

- Performance measurement is a high priority of the Virginia DMV. Because of this, the DMV is undertaking a project to include at least six states in a benchmarking study. The study will assist participating agencies to identify common criteria/measures and to collect and compare data on an ongoing basis.

III. Survey Results, by Agency

III.1 Missouri Department of Revenue

Scope of Review

- The primary focus of this review was the Missouri Department of Revenue (DOR), Division of Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing. Contacts in this division were interviewed and helped to complete a survey of performance measures.
- SMG also reviewed published information about performance measures used by the Division of Tax (fuel tax program only) and the Division of Administration (selected information technology measures).

Agency Operations

- Missouri's Division of Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing (the Division) is similar to the Washington DOL in terms of the total number of drivers it licenses and the total number of certificates of title issued per year.
- The Division includes a Customer Assistance Bureau (field operations), Driver Services Bureau, Vehicle Services Bureau, and Information Technology Bureau.
- Unlike the DOL, the Division co-locates its services for drivers and vehicles in state and contractor offices.
- The Division contracts out most services. Eleven state offices and 170 contractors (mostly small, but some very large) provide the full range of services for drivers and vehicles.
- Information technology support services such as network and desktop support are centralized in the Department. Application development and maintenance is distributed to each Division.
- The Division provides for registration renewals using the Internet. The Division does not currently provide Internet-based driver licensing and does not plan to provide this service.

Overview of the Department's Strategic Planning and Performance Management

- The Office of Budget and Strategic Planning is responsible for oversight and guidance of the strategic planning process.
- The Missouri DOR's strategic planning process is very "bottom-up", according to interviewees. Operating units are directly involved in the planning process.
 - Each spring, executive staff revisits the mission, vision, desired outcomes of the agency.
 - Following this, a 13 member team of senior management examines an opportunities and threats analysis to make further recommendations about strategic direction.
 - Finally, project/service owners have discussions to set targets for each product.

- In keeping with the DOR's customer-centered culture, the agency refers to basic customer service elements (Driver's License, Title, Registration, for example) as customer "products". All strategies and measures are product-oriented.

Use of Performance Measures for Management

- According to interviewees, performance measurement is part of the DOR's culture. Each new employee is expected to understand his/her role with respect to the strategic plan, key products, and measures before they begin work.
- DOR management believes that product owners should be directly responsible for their product area's performance. Consequently, performance measures are carefully monitored and activities are adjusted to improve performance.
- Performance measures are reviewed with product owners and deputy directors monthly. Measures are reviewed at the department level quarterly.
- On an annual basis, product owners revisit or reconstruct measures as necessary.
- Product owners are also responsible to collect and analyze their own data as necessary.

Guidance for and Use of Performance Measures/Benchmarks by Oversight Agencies

- In 2001, Missouri's Managing for Results Initiative or MRI was implemented by Executive Order 01-19.
 - Managing for Results is a long-term commitment to doing business more efficiently and effectively. MRI is a management tool for the Governor and his cabinet to help keep government focused on results and to achieve meaningful improvement for citizens.
 - The MRI provides general guidelines for planning, budgeting and performance measurement.
- MRI requires performance measures to be included in agency budgets.
 - Budget measures are limited to six per "product".
 - Budgets are to include a measure of efficiency, effectiveness, number of clients/individuals served, and customer satisfaction.
 - There are no separate measures for information technology required in the budget.
- The DOR's three most recent strategic plans and performance measures are published on the "Missouri Managing for Results" web site.

Oversight Measures/Benchmarks (Baselines)

- The Department of Revenue's Fiscal Year 2005 Strategic Plan includes a set of 46 performance measures addressing the areas of Drivers, Field Office Contact, Motor Vehicle Registration, Motor Vehicle Title, Dealer Registration, Fuel Tax, and Information Technology. (See Exhibit V3-b.) A subset of 16 of these measures is included in the budget.
- Each measure identified in the strategic plan has a baseline (or benchmark) value that is generated using actual performance in the most recent year.

- Measures address a variety of categories, including customer service, workload, timeliness, and accuracy that are related to four key outcomes:
 - Increased customer satisfaction
 - Increased voluntary compliance
 - Decreased cost of compliance
 - Increased quality performance
- Measures and benchmarks/baselines for Call Center Standards will be added to subsequent versions of the Strategic Plan.
- The Division of Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing did not identify any operational measures.

Benchmarking

- The DOR's 2005 Strategic Plan includes comparisons of measure baselines to baselines from up to three peer states. These data are compiled from an annual survey of AAMVA members, requesting data in a form that can be compared to Missouri measures.
- Each product owner selects benchmarking peers or partners that are appropriate for his/her measures.

III.2 Tennessee Department of Safety

Scope of Review

- The Tennessee Department of Safety (DOS) includes five divisions that are of interest in this study:
 - Drivers License Issuance
 - Title and Registration
 - Financial Responsibility
 - Professional Standards (Driver Improvement)
 - Commercial Vehicle Enforcement (IFTA, IRP, Fuel Tax)
 - Information Systems (components relating to vehicle and driver services)
- We were able to obtain data for the following program areas, since strategic plans and budgets are presented by program:
 - Administration (selected relevant data)
 - Driver License Issuance
 - Titling and Registration
 - Technical Services (Information Systems, Driver Improvement and Financial Responsibility)

Agency Operations

- The DOS is similar to the Washington DOL in terms of the total number of drivers it licenses and the total number of Certificates of Title it issues each year.
- County Clerks, by law, are the agents for all vehicle registration in Tennessee. The DOS also contracts with selected County Clerks for some vehicle title and driver licensing activities, including renewals, duplicates, and non-testing services in locations without state driver licensing offices. Approximately 82% of titles are handled by County Clerks; the remainder have issues that must be resolved by the central office.
- The DOS provides information technology support to County Clerks for drivers licensing. All other activities are supported, for the most part, by county-based systems and technologies.
 - Some counties contract with “Local Government”; a vendor that specializes in processing licensing transactions of all types.
 - County and vendor data are shared in batch mode (usually nightly) with the DOS.
- The TDOS provides Internet driver license renewal. To date, only one county (Hamilton County) provides internet access to vehicle title and registration services.
- The TDOS maintains two call centers: one for Financial Responsibility and one for Title and Registration. Call center applications are operated by two different vendors, but both provide call handling data.

Overview of the Department’s Strategic Planning and Performance Management

- The Government Accountability Act of 2002 (the Act) requires Tennessee state agencies to phase-in strategic planning and performance-based budgeting.
- The DOS is one of four state agencies selected for the first phase of this effort. As such, the agency has developed its 2005-2009 Strategic Plan using strict guidelines that are issued by the Commissioner of Finance and Administration.
- The Government Accountability Act also requires agencies to develop performance standards and measures.
 - According to the Act, measures must be outcome-oriented, address efficiency, and be time-bound.
 - Measures are submitted and approved with the Department’s budget request.
 - The DOS’s newest measures were approved in May, 2004. Once measures are approved, they may not be changed until the next appropriation cycle unless there are changes in operations that result from court action, law, executive order, or changes in federal funding.
- A central Office of Strategic Planning (2 FTE positions) manages all strategic planning and performance measurement, including plan development, monitoring, and data collection and reporting.
- Because of the requirements of the Act, linkages between strategic plans, performance measures and agency budgets are very clear.

Use of Performance Measures for Management

- Prior to the enactment of the Government Accountability Act, performance measurement was not formal or well-organized within the DOS. (The agency has been using some kind of strategic plan since 1997.)
- The Act has forced thoughtful development of measures and standards, and routine monitoring of performance against these measures.
- Measures are primarily used for oversight and review at the executive level. According to interviewees, operating units may review performance, but do not necessarily understand the connection of specific measures to the strategic goals and objectives of the DOS.
- The Office of Strategic Planning is currently the compiler and keeper of performance data related to the official “oversight” performance measures. Data are submitted/compiled from a variety of sources on a monthly or quarterly basis (depending on the measure) and are maintained in Excel spreadsheets and Word documents. The Office of Strategic Planning provides an “At-a-Glance” view of measures by goal that includes an explanation of the reason for each measure’s selection and of the target values chosen.
- The DOS maintains its key operating performance measures in an Excel spreadsheet tool that provides baseline values, target values, actual performance and graphs of results. Several of the key operating measures are used for oversight reporting purposes as well.
- Data are reported to department managers on a quarterly basis.

Guidance for and Use of Performance Measures by Oversight Agencies

- Strategic plans and related performance measures are contractual in Tennessee. The Commissioner of Finance and Administration must annually evaluate the DOS’s compliance with its strategic plan and performance measures and report to the Senate and House of Representatives.
- The DOS is also subject to performance review of its activities by the Comptroller of the Treasury. The frequency and focus of these audits have yet to be determined, but the Act does require that the audits include consideration of the efficient use of state and federal funds, additional non-state revenue or cost-savings that could be achieved, and the extent that strategic plan objectives are achieved.

Oversight Measures/Benchmarks (Baselines)

- We identified 17 unique measures that appear in the DOS Strategic Plan for the Driver License Issuance, Financial Responsibility, Titling and Registration and Technical Services Programs. Four of these are also presented in the DOS Annual Report, five are in the budget. Only one measure was found in the Annual Report that was not found in all other sources as well.
- Measures describe workload, efficiency, customer service, and timeliness. Measures are designed to support the following strategic goals:
 - Highway safety
 - Customer service

- Quality data
 - Valued employees
- No revenue-related measures are presented in the Strategic Plan.
 - Benchmarks or baseline values have been identified for all measures in the Strategic Plan. They are generally the prior year's actual performance. Budget-type target values are also identified for each measure.

Benchmarking

- Missouri DOS does not formally compare its measures with peer agencies. The agency does occasionally review Internet-published measures and data from Arizona, Missouri, Florida, and Ohio to look for similarities and differences in performance.

III.3 Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles

Scope of Review

- The Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) is responsible for driver licensing and driver-related services, vehicle titles and registrations, and commercial vehicle services. A single contact was able to answer our questions about the agency.
- The Motor Vehicle Dealer Board, a separate agency, manages and enforces motor vehicle dealer laws. We did not interview a representative from the Board, but did collect published performance information about its activities.

Agency Operations

- The Virginia DMV is similar to Washington DOL in terms of the number of Certificates of Title it issues each year. The Commonwealth of Virginia has significantly more licensed drivers than does Washington State.
- Driver and vehicle services are co-located. The Department provides driver and vehicle services face to face at 73 Customer Services Centers. In addition, customers may complete transactions by mail, the Internet, or Interactive Voice Response (IVR) telephone.
- License Agents (private entities) transact vehicle-related business in geographic areas that are not served by Customer Services Centers.
- Information technology is centralized within the Department.

Overview of the Department's Strategic Planning and Performance Management

- Virginia DMV's current "Management for Results" system has been operational since 1995. It specifies four key processes: strategic planning, performance measurement, program evaluation, and performance budgeting.
- HB 2097, passed in 2003, created the Government Performance and Results Act, which requires state agencies to develop strategic plans and performance measures that enhance agency efficiency and effectiveness and support the objectives of the Governor and the Council.
- All agencies are required by law to identify objective and quantifiable measures to determine how well programs are performing. Virginia uses four types of measures: efficiency measures, input measures, outcome measures, and output measures.
- Virginia maintains a statewide performance measurement database that allows queries and reports of performance information.
- Performance measures for state agencies, including the Department of Motor Vehicles, are published on the "Virginia Results" website at www.dpb.state.va.us/VAResults/Index.cfm.
- The DMV also maintains a Management Scorecard, as part of its "Virginia Excels" program. The scorecard rates agencies in five areas, including Human Resources Management, Government Procurement, Financial Management, Technology, and Performance Management Departmental Activities

- Within the DMV, the Deputy Commissioner for Administration is responsible for planning and performance measurement. There are separate units for strategic planning and performance measurement within Administration.
- The DMV is just beginning to embrace strategic planning, and is preparing its draft Strategic Plan. Even though the state's "Management for Results" initiative included strategic planning as an important component, Virginia is just now guiding agencies through a structured planning process.
- Because performance measures were identified and reported long before the creation of the strategic plan, the Director of Planning does not see much connection yet between the plan and performance measures.

Use of Performance Measures for Management

- Managers collect and use data to manage operations, but there is no formal monitoring or reporting of performance information. The DMV recently abandoned use of a "scorecard" approach to performance measurement and reporting, and is attempting instead to define key criteria/measures that should be reported and compared with peer agencies on a routine basis. (Some units are still using the old scorecard format.)
- There is no concrete relationship between the oversight measures and the agency's budget.
- The DMV does not formally monitor or report the following measures (although these may be reported/managed at an operational level):
 - Test scheduling backlogs
 - Time to process a vehicle registration
 - Time to distribute a copy of the title. Timeliness of vehicle title documents is not an issue for this agency, since clean titles (no liens or other problems) are prepared for the customer at time of service.
 - Title accuracy. This has not been an issue, since large dealers and many small dealers are able to do on-line transaction processing.
 - Dollars collected per dollar spent (for revenue-generating activities). The Department is working on a cost-allocation methodology to better support its decision-making.

Guidance for and Use of Performance Measures/Benchmarks by Oversight Agencies

- The DMV is subject to review by the Auditor of Public Accounts (financial and management audits), the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (audits) and the Department of Planning and Budget.
- As mentioned earlier, the DMV is required to report the four key measures to the Department of Planning and Budget, and these are published on the internet for inspection by the public.

Oversight Measures/Benchmarks (Baselines)

- The DMV has reported performance to the Governor on three key measures since 1996. (A fourth measure will be added this year.)

- Each of the three key measures has a baseline value. Two are set at the most recent level of performance. The benchmark/baseline for the measure “cost per customer served” is set at a fixed cost that the DMV manages to.
- Target values are established for each of the three measures. “Percent of Customer Satisfaction and Service Effectiveness” and “Percent of Customers Using Mail Service, Telecommunications, and Electronic Means for processing and paying renewal transactions” use stretch targets, or targets that are desirable but may or may not be achieved by a particular time period.
- The Commonwealth of Virginia also maintains a Management Scorecard, as part of its “Virginia Excels” program. The scorecard rates agencies in five areas, including Human Resources Management, Government Procurement, Financial Management, Technology, and Performance Management.

Benchmarking

- The DMV has identified performance management as a high priority. Because of this, the Department is undertaking a project to convene at least six states to participate in a benchmarking study. The study, to be conducted by consultant Cost Effectiveness Measures Inc. (CEM) will assist participating agencies to identify common criteria/measures and to collect and compare data on an ongoing basis.

Appendix 3A
Documents, Information Sources, and Interviewees

Missouri Documents/Information Sources

- State of Missouri Office of Administration, Division of Budget and Planning, Fiscal Year 2006 Budget Instructions. (www.oa.mo.gov/bp/budget.htm)
- The Missouri Budget, FY 2005. (www.oa.mo.gov/bp/bib2005.htm)
- Missouri Managing for Results, Executive Order #01-19. (www.mri.missouri.gov/mfr/EO.html).
- Missouri Department of Revenue's FY2006 Budget (without Governor's Recommendations) – Confidential Internal Version, November 2004.
- Missouri Department of Revenue Fiscal Year 2005 Strategic Plan (sections relating to Division of Motor Vehicle and Drivers Licensing, Division of Administration/Information Technology, and Division of Tax/Fuel Tax Return only.)

Tennessee Documents/Information Sources

- State of Tennessee Department of Safety Budget, 2004 – 2005.
- Tennessee Department of Safety Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2002-2003.
- Transmittal Letter and Document from The Honorable Phil Bredesen, Governor, State of Tennessee Agency Strategic Plans, September 1, 2003.
- Tennessee Department of Safety Strategic Goals 2004 and Agency Strategic Plan (Five Year Plan) Parts 1 and 2, September 2004.
- Tennessee Motor Vehicle FY 03-04 Performance Measure Spreadsheet (internal document)
- Tennessee Department of Safety, Professional Standards Division, Office of Strategic Planning, "Motor Vehicle Performance Measures At-A-Glance FY 04-05."
- Tennessee Department of Finance and Administration, Division of Budget, "Strategic Planning and Performance Measurement: A Guide for State Agencies", May 2004.

Virginia Documents/Information Sources

- "Virginia Excels" website; (www.vaexcels.governor.virginia.gov/accomplishments-PBM.cfm).
- "Virginia Results" website; (www.dpb.state.va.us/VAResults/HomePage),
- "Virginia Results" Planning and Performance Report, Department of Motor Vehicles, May 18, 2004. (www.dpb.state.va.us/VAResults/PP/PublicReport.cfm?vAgency=154)
- Commonwealth of Virginia, Agency Head Executive Agreement (template), February 6, 2002.
- "Evaluation Criteria for Governor's Management Scorecard" and "Management Scorecard", (www.vaexcels.governor.virginia.gov/performance/ScorecardCriteria.htm) and (www.vaexcels.governor.virginia.gov/performance/scorecardResultsPrint.cfm).
- Commonwealth of Virginia 2004 Executive Budget, Office of Transportation, Motor Vehicle Dealer Board.

- “Virginia Results” Planning and Performance Report, Motor Vehicle Dealer Board, May 18, 2004. (www.dpb.state.va.us/VAResults/PP/PublicReport.cfm?vAgency=506)
- U.S. General Services Administration, Office of Governmentwide Policy, Office of Real Property, Innovative Workplaces Division, “Performance Management System for the State of Virginia”: article in “Strategic Planning: Aligning Workplace Services Creates Value”, June 2002.
(www.gsa.gov/gsa/cm_attachments/GSA_DOCUMENT/2002stratplan)
- Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles Six-Year Strategic Plan, November 18, 2003, (Governor’s Confidential Working Draft).
- Commonwealth of Virginia, Virginia Department of Planning and Budget, “Agency Strategic Planning and Performance Measurement Phase 1 Guidelines”, May 2004.
- Commonwealth of Virginia, Auditor of Public Accounts, “Review of Performance Measures Reported on the Virginia Results Website”, November 8, 2002.

Other Information

- State of Maryland, Department of Transportation, 2005 Budget.
- State of Minnesota, Public Safety Department, 2006-07 Biennial Budget.
- State of Arizona, 2003-2005 Master List of State Government Programs.
(www.ospb.state.az.us)
- State of Arizona, Office of Strategic Planning and Budgeting, “1998 Strategic Planning and Performance Measurement Handbook”.

Interviewees

Missouri Department of Revenue

Michille Bosch, Manager, Customer Assistance Bureau

Lynn Bexton, Administrator, Customer Assistance Bureau

Kay Freidinger, Director of Budget and Strategic Planning

Tennessee Department of Safety

Tiffany Taylor, Deputy Director of Driver Licenses

Emily Passino and Michael Hogan, Directors of Strategic Planning for the Department of Safety

Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles

Dick Moschler, Director of Planning

Appendix 3B
Interview Guides and Survey Instructions

Performance Benchmarks – Survey of Other States Initial Interview Guide

Agency Organization

- 1) How are driver services organized? Vehicle services? (Confirm organizational details.)
- 2) How are information services organized in your agency (centralized, decentralized)?
- 3) Does IS participate in performance management?
- 4) Who in the organization is responsible for performance management (defining measures, collecting and reporting data)?
- 5) To what extent are services in your agency privatized?
- 6) To what extent does your agency use alternative service delivery methods (Internet, mail, IVR?)

Overview of Strategic Planning/Performance Measurement

- 1) Does your agency have a strategic plan? Is there an attempt to link the measures to this plan? Are there any state mandates for strategic planning?
- 2) Briefly describe the use of performance measurement in your agency. How long has your agency been using performance measurement? Are there any state mandates? Do you use particular models or guidelines, e.g. Balanced Scorecard, GASB, Managing for Results, Performance Based Budgeting?
- 3) At what levels in the organization are measures collected and used?
- 4) What oversight agencies are interested in your measures? How do you report to them?
- 5) How were oversight measures identified?

Use of Benchmarks

- 1) Do you set performance benchmarks, baselines or standards for each of your measures?
- 2) Do you compare your performance to that of other agencies? How often? If so, what is the value to you of benchmarking performance against peer agencies?
- 3) How were your comparative/peer agencies selected? What criteria did you use?
- 4) How long have you been comparing results with other agencies?
- 5) Have you started to benchmark web-based transactions?

Performance Benchmarks – Survey of Other States Follow-up Interview Guide

Matrix Questions

- 1) If targets are identified, are they “stretch” targets (desirable objectives, but may not be achieved in the near term) or budget targets (targets that are projected to be achieved by a specific time period)?
- 2) How often are measures compared with other jurisdictions?

Measurement Questions

- 1) Do you measure:
 - Title accuracy
 - Drivers license accuracy
 - Wait time? If so, how is it used?
 - Cost of internet transactions?
 - Cost of transactions to customer? To state?
 - Expenditures for revenue collected (efficiency)
 - Customer satisfaction
- 2) How are these measures defined? Calculated? Used? Benchmarked against other agencies?

(Name of Agency)
Performance Measurement and Benchmarking Survey

Instructions:

The State of Washington, Transportation Performance Audit Board (TPAB) has retained SMG/Columbia Consulting to conduct a review of the Washington Department of Licensing's Transportation-Related Performance and Outcome Measures. Our focus is on drivers and vehicle services, and information technology as it relates to each of these programs.

As part of this study, we are contacting your agency to better understand how you are using performance measures and benchmarks for reporting and improving agency performance.

Please help us by completing the following two tables:

Oversight Measures are those that are reported to the Governor, Legislature, other oversight agencies, or the public on a regular basis. These are the measures that might appear in a Strategic Plan, budget document, performance agreement between the agency and the Governor for example. If your agency has published measures on the Internet, we have included them in this table to get you started.

Operational Measures are measures that are important to the internal monitoring and management of your agency. In many cases, these may be the same as the oversight measures. Select the most important measures that are routinely monitored in your agency – generally not more than five or six for each operating area. If you have published sources of these measures you may submit those to us instead.

Each table includes the following columns:

- (1) Provide the common name and/or a brief description of the performance measure used.
- (2) Where is the measure reported? Name the specific document or general type of report.
- (3) Has a baseline value, benchmark, or reference point been established for this measure?
- (4) How was the baseline value, benchmark, or reference point, created for this measure?
- (5) Have one or more goals or target values been established for this measure?
- (6) Is this a "stretch" target (one that is desirable but may or may not be achieved in the near term or a "budget" target (one that is predicted to be achieved during a specific time period)?
- (7) Is this measure routinely compared with a similar measure in peer agencies? Provide the names of these agencies.
- (8) Provide any comments you feel are necessary to clarify this information.

(Name of Agency)
Performance Measures

OVERSIGHT MEASURES

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported? ¹	(3) Base line Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments

¹ Note specific sources (if necessary) in footnotes

(Name of Agency)
Performance Measures

OPERATIONAL MEASURES

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported?	(3) Base line Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
GENERAL							
DRIVERS							
VEHICLES							

**Review of Performance and Outcome Measures of the
Washington Department of Licensing's Transportation-Related
Programs**

Appendix 3C – Survey Candidate Evaluation Criteria

Review of Performance and Outcome Measures of the
Washington State Department of Licensing's Transportation-Related Programs

Survey Candidate Evaluation Criteria

GENERAL INFORMATION					
State	(1) Reason for Consideration	(2) State's Use of Performance Measurement		(3) Description of Any MV Privatization or Third Party Arrangements	(4) Vehicle/ Drivers Co- Located?
		(A) Managing for Results Rating	(B) Using PBB or Performance Management?		
Alabama	Drivers, Titles	D+	?	Counties issue driver licenses, titles, tabs	No
Arizona	VS, Drivers	C+	Yes	Third party vehicle registration	Yes, most
Georgia	VS, Titles	B-	?	County tax commissioners issue tags and titles	No
Indiana	DS, Drivers, Titles	B-	?	Three license branches operated by banks	Yes
Maryland	Drivers	B	Yes	Title services provided by private businesses licensed by State. Also licensed dealers.	Yes
Massachusetts	DS, Drivers	C	?	Dealers, insurance companies may register and title.	Yes
Minnesota	Titles	B	Yes	Some satellite offices are privately owned.	Yes
Missouri	Drivers, Titles	A-	Yes	Title services provided by private businesses licensed by State. Also licensed dealers.	Yes
Tennessee	DS, Drivers, Titles	B-	Yes	County clerks title and register vehicles.	No
Wisconsin	Drivers, Titles	B-	?	Bank lock box for registration renewals. Dealer processing of title applications.	Some
Virginia	VS, Titles	A-	Yes	Some services are delivered through agreements with certain franchised auto dealers, rental agencies, and state and local government authorities.	Yes
Washington				County Auditors and subagents title and register vehicles.	No

Sources/Notes:

- (1) States were considered if they:
- a) Were recommended by DOL representatives during interviews (VS = Vehicle Services, DS = Driver Services)
 - b) Had between 3.5 and 4.5 million licensed drivers in 2002 per the AAMVA (Drivers)
 - c) Had between 1.5 and 2.5 million Certificates of Title issued during 2003 per the AAMVA (Titles)
- (2) (A) Governing Magazine's Grading the States 2001 (www.governing.com/gpp/2001/gp1intro.htm). This study grades the state, not the agency, but is used as a general indicator of use of performance measurement.
- (2) (B) Subjective assessment, based on the following sources: GASB Performance Measures for Government, State Initiatives (www.seagov.org/initiatives/state_gov.shtml) and review of state planning and budget sites
- (3) Source: AAMVA "Fast Track to Vehicle Services Facts, 2003", Section 7-1
- (4) Source: Agency web sites. "Co-located" is defined as driver services and vehicle services being offered at the same office, location, or outlet.

Review of Performance and Outcome Measures of the
Washington State Department of Licensing's Transportation-Related Programs

Survey Candidate Evaluation Criteria

DRIVERS DATA				
State	(5) Drivers Licensing Organization	(6) Licensed Total Drivers	(7) # of Driver Licensing Offices	(8) On-Line Drivers' License Renewals?
Alabama	Alabama Department of Public Safety, Drivers License Division - drive test Counties or Probate Judge - license document, renewals	3,577,986	81	No
Arizona	Arizona Dept. of Transportation, Motor Vehicle Division	3,668,326	58	Yes
Georgia	Georgia Department of Motor Vehicle Services	6,012,847	unknown	Yes
Indiana	Bureau of Motor Vehicles	4,221,123	169	Yes
Maryland	Maryland Department of Transportation, Motor Vehicle Administration	3,523,311	25	No
Massachusetts	Massachusetts Registry of Motor Vehicles	4,686,416	35	Yes
Minnesota	Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Driver and Vehicle Services Division	2,997,058	136	No
Missouri	Missouri Department of Revenue, Division of Motor Vehicle and Drivers Licensing	3,931,448	183	No
Tennessee	Tennessee Department of Safety, Motor Vehicle Services, Driver License Issuance Division	4,205,933	44 (12 express for duplicates and renewals)	Yes
Wisconsin	Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Drivers & Vehicles	3,529,720	88	No
Virginia	Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles	5,158,232	74	Yes
Washington	Washington Department of Licensing	4,381,417	63 (plus 3 travel units)	Yes

Sources/Notes:

(5) Source: agency web sites (as of October, 2004)

(6) Source: AAMVA Licensed Total Drivers, by Age 2002

(7) Source: agency web sites (as of October, 2004). Counts not verified.

(8) Source: agency web sites (as of October, 2004)

Review of Performance and Outcome Measures of the
Washington State Department of Licensing's Transportation-Related Programs

Survey Candidate Evaluation Criteria

VEHICLES DATA						
State	(9) Vehicle Licensing Organization	(10) Total # of Certificates of Title Issued Per Year	(11) # of Offices where Registrations are Issued	(12) Use of Internet Transactions - Vehicles	(13) Renewal Methods Other Than Mail or In Person?	(14) Privatization of Title or Registration Services
Alabama	Alabama Department of Revenue, Motor Vehicles Division	1,544,086	79	Yes - some counties	Internet	No
Arizona	Arizona Dept. of Transportation, Motor Vehicle Division	1,461,112	58	Registration renewals	Phone, internet	Pilot
Georgia	County Tax Commissioner (tags & titles) Motor Vehicle Services Section (title only)	1,954,633	Unknown	No	Drop box, internet (?)	No
Indiana	Bureau of Motor Vehicles	1,828,152	170	Registration renewals	ATM, drop box, internet	Yes
Maryland	Maryland Department of Transportation, Motor Vehicle Administration	1,180,522	16	Registration renewals, address changes	Internet	Yes
Massachusetts	Massachusetts Registry of Motor Vehicles	1,360,000	34	Registration renewals, duplicate registrations	Phone, drop box, internet	Yes
Minnesota	Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Driver and Vehicle Services Division	1,730,000	171	Registration renewals, address changes	Internet	Yes
Missouri	Missouri Department of Revenue, Division of Motor Vehicle and Drivers Licensing	2,344,858	180	Registration renewals	Internet	Yes
Tennessee	Tennessee Department of Safety, Motor Vehicle Services, Title & Registration Division	2,127,997	100	No	None	Yes
Wisconsin	Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Drivers & Vehicles	2,066,000	28	Registration renewals	Phone, internet	Yes
Virginia	Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles	1,805,504	76	Registration renewals, address changes	Phone (VM), Internet, Call Center	Yes
Washington	Washington Department of Licensing	1,977,652	186	Registration renewals, seller Report of Sale	Drop box, internet	Yes

Sources/Notes:

(9) Agency web sites (as of October, 2004)

(10) AAMVA "Fast Track to Vehicle Services Facts, 2003", Section 2-8. Includes Original and Duplicate titles. (Washington duplicates not available.)

(11) AAMVA "Fast Track to Vehicle Services Facts, 2003", Section 7-15

(12) AAMVA "Fast Track to Vehicle Services Facts, 2003", Section 7-17

(13) AAMVA "Fast Track to Vehicle Services Facts, 2003", Section 3-12

(14) AAMVA "Fast Track to Vehicle Services Facts, 2003", Section 7-1

Appendix 3D
Summary of Oversight Measures
Used by Survey Agencies

**Review of Performance and Outcome Measures of the
Washington State Department of Licensing's Transportation-Related Programs
Summary of Oversight Measures Used by Survey Agencies**

Performance Measure/ Description	Where Reported, by Agency ¹					
	Missouri DOR ²	Tennessee DOS ³	Virginia DMV and MVDB ⁴	Maryland DMV ⁵	Minnesota DPS ⁶	Arizona MVD ⁷
ALL SERVICES						
Social Outcomes						
Reduction in the number of highway fatalities related to alcohol use and lack of seatbelt use			Virginia Results (to be added)			
Efficiency						
Cost per customer served (in dollars)			Virginia Results			
FIELD OFFICE SERVICES (DRIVER AND/OR VEHICLES)						
Workload						
Number of field office transactions processed	Strategic Plan			Budget		
Customer Service						
Average wait time in minutes – arrival to assistance at counter (motor vehicle and drivers license)	Strategic Plan		Report to Governor			
Average branch office customer visit time (minutes)				Budget		Master List
Percent of non-test applicants issued a license within 15 minutes after examiner pulls record		Strategic Plan, Annual Report				

¹ Agencies in Missouri, Tennessee, and Virginia were an official part of this study. Other agency information was extracted from published sources and may be incomplete.

² Fiscal Year 2005 Strategic Plan – Missouri Department of Revenue

³ Tennessee Department of Safety Agency Strategic Plan, Part 2 - Performance Measures, September 2004, Tennessee Department of Safety Annual Report Fiscal Year 2002-2003, State of Tennessee 2004-2005 Budget

⁴ Virginia Results Planning and Performance Report, May 2004", Virginia Department of Planning and Budget (web published). Does not include "Management Scorecard" measures.

⁵ Maryland Department of Transportation 2005 Budget (web published)

⁶ State of Minnesota Public Safety Department, 2006-07 Biennial Budget (web published)

⁷ Arizona 2003-2005 Master List of State Government Programs (web published)

**Review of Performance and Outcome Measures of the
Washington State Department of Licensing's Transportation-Related Programs
Summary of Oversight Measures Used by Survey Agencies**

Performance Measure/ Description	Where Reported, by Agency ¹					
	Missouri DOR ²	Tennessee DOS ³	Virginia DMV and MVDB ⁴	Maryland DMV ⁵	Minnesota DPS ⁶	Arizona MVD ⁷
Wait time for skills (road) test appointments					Budget	
Percentage of customers completing their transactions during first visit to a field office	Strategic Plan					
Customer Satisfaction/Agency Image/Reputation						
Customer satisfaction with services (rated by survey or other means)			Virginia Results	Budget		Master List
Percent of branch office customers rating facility appearance as Good or Very Good				Budget		
Percent of branch office customers rating employee helpfulness as Good or Very Good				Budget		
Efficiency						
Percent of non-test driver license field transactions conducted at County Clerk offices.		Strategic Plan, Annual Report				
DRIVER-RELATED SERVICES						
Workload						
Number of driver licenses produced (total, initial, non-driver/ID only)	Strategic Plan, Budget				Budget	
Number of renewal licenses produced	Strategic Plan					
Number of knowledge and skill examinations completed					Budget	
Number of drivers for which privileges were suspended, canceled, revoked or disqualified					Budget	
Number of drivers for which privileges were reinstated					Budget	
Number of all offenses handled by Financial Responsibility		Strategic Plan, Annual Report				

**Review of Performance and Outcome Measures of the
Washington State Department of Licensing's Transportation-Related Programs
Summary of Oversight Measures Used by Survey Agencies**

Performance Measure/ Description	Where Reported, by Agency ¹					
	Missouri DOR ²	Tennessee DOS ³	Virginia DMV and MVDB ⁴	Maryland DMV ⁵	Minnesota DPS ⁶	Arizona MVD ⁷
Customer Service						
Percent of time driver license renewal notifications mailed on time.	Strategic Plan/Outcomes					
Percent of hearings held within 60 days of point-suspension letter		Strategic Plan, Annual Report				
Customer cost (time and fees) to obtain an initial license	Strategic Plan					
Customer cost (time and fees) to obtain renewal license	Strategic Plan					
Efficiency						
Department's cost to produce a drivers license (total and vendor document cost only)	Strategic Plan					
Department's cost to produce a renewal license (total and vendor document cost only)	Strategic Plan					
Percent of court records received electronically		Strategic Plan				
Percent of crash reports received electronically		Strategic Plan				
Effectiveness						
Percentage of driver licenses produced correctly on the first attempt	Budget					
DUI hearings dismissal rate						
Timeliness						
Processing time for issuance of a Driver's License (request received until license is sent through mail)					Budget	
Average number of days to complete record updates						Master List

**Review of Performance and Outcome Measures of the
Washington State Department of Licensing's Transportation-Related Programs
Summary of Oversight Measures Used by Survey Agencies**

Performance Measure/ Description	Where Reported, by Agency ¹					
	Missouri DOR ²	Tennessee DOS ³	Virginia DMV and MVDB ⁴	Maryland DMV ⁵	Minnesota DPS ⁶	Arizona MVD ⁷
Total average days to process DUI-related hearings						Master List
Average elapsed time in calendar days between the department's receiving mandatory convictions from the court and mailing the letter revoking the driver license		Strategic Plan				
Revenue						
Revenue generated (millions)	Strategic Plan, Budget					
Renewal revenue generated (millions)	Strategic Plan					
VEHICLE-RELATED SERVICES						
Revenue						
Total revenue collected –Vehicle Services					Budget	
MOTOR VEHICLE TITLE & REGISTRATION						
Workload						
Number of motor vehicle registrations produced (millions)	Strategic Plan, Budget					
Number of titles produced (millions)	Strategic Plan, Budget				Budget	
Percent of titles issued locally by County Clerks		Strategic Plan, Annual Report				
Customer Service						
Percent of time motor vehicle and marine craft registration renewal notifications mailed on time.	Strategic Plan (Outcomes)					
Number of days to process a title, by type	Strategic Plan, Budget				Budget	

**Review of Performance and Outcome Measures of the
Washington State Department of Licensing's Transportation-Related Programs
Summary of Oversight Measures Used by Survey Agencies**

Performance Measure/ Description	Where Reported, by Agency ¹					
	Missouri DOR ²	Tennessee DOS ³	Virginia DMV and MVDB ⁴	Maryland DMV ⁵	Minnesota DPS ⁶	Arizona MVD ⁷
Cost to customers (time and money) to obtain/renew a registration – per customer	Strategic Plan					
Customers cost (time and money) to obtain a title – per customer	Strategic Plan					
Efficiency						
Agency cost to produce motor vehicle registrations (millions)	Strategic Plan					
Agency cost to produce one motor vehicle registration	Strategic Plan					
Total cost to customers of motor vehicle registration (in \$)	Strategic Plan					
Agency's cost to produce titles (in \$)	Strategic Plan					
Agency cost to produce one title	Strategic Plan					
Total cost to customers of motor vehicle titles (in \$)	Strategic Plan					
Cost to correct registration mistakes (thousands)	Strategic Plan					
Cost to correct title mistakes (millions)	Strategic Plan				Budget	
Effectiveness						
Percentage of registrations produced correctly/percent of renewal registration errors	Strategic Plan, Budget	Strategic Plan, Budget, Annual Report				
Percentage of motor vehicle title transactions completed correctly	Strategic Plan, Budget					

**Review of Performance and Outcome Measures of the
Washington State Department of Licensing's Transportation-Related Programs
Summary of Oversight Measures Used by Survey Agencies**

Performance Measure/ Description	Where Reported, by Agency ¹					
	Missouri DOR ²	Tennessee DOS ³	Virginia DMV and MVDB ⁴	Maryland DMV ⁵	Minnesota DPS ⁶	Arizona MVD ⁷
Number of units in which quality control has been implemented		Strategic Plan				
Timeliness						
Number of days to process one registration (Number of days to update registration information in the general registration system.)	Strategic Plan, Budget				Budget	
Revenue						
Registration revenue generated (millions)	Strategic Plan, Budget					
Title revenue generated (millions)	Strategic Plan, Budget					
DEALER REGISTRATION						
Workload						
Total number of dealerships licensed	Budget				Budget	
Number of new motor vehicle salespersons licensed			Virginia Results			
Number of customer assistance requests received regarding motor vehicle dealer operations			Virginia Results			
Customer Service						
Percent of initial salesperson applicants denied a license			Virginia Results			

**Review of Performance and Outcome Measures of the
Washington State Department of Licensing's Transportation-Related Programs
Summary of Oversight Measures Used by Survey Agencies**

Performance Measure/ Description	Where Reported, by Agency ¹					
	Missouri DOR ²	Tennessee DOS ³	Virginia DMV and MVDB ⁴	Maryland DMV ⁵	Minnesota DPS ⁶	Arizona MVD ⁷
Percent of dealer complaint cases issued and closed within a certain number of days/Average number of days to close a dealer investigation case				Budget		Master List
Percent of customer e-mail assistance requests that are processed within five business days.			Virginia Results			
Percentage of initial salesperson license applications processed within seven business days.			Virginia Results			
Revenue						
Total revenue collected	Budget					
FUEL TAX						
Workload						
Number of returns filed	Strategic Plan, Budget					
Number of telephone calls received	Strategic Plan, Budget					
Efficiency						
Ratio of dollars collected for every dollar spent on fuel tax evasion enforcement efforts						Master List
Percent of motor carrier forms that are manually processed.						
Effectiveness						
Percent of returns without errors	Strategic Plan					
Timeliness						
Number of days from receipt to deposit	Strategic Plan, Budget					
Percent of tax reports filed that were also fully paid on time or that did not owe taxes	Strategic Plan					Master List

**Review of Performance and Outcome Measures of the
Washington State Department of Licensing's Transportation-Related Programs
Summary of Oversight Measures Used by Survey Agencies**

Performance Measure/ Description	Where Reported, by Agency ¹					
	Missouri DOR ²	Tennessee DOS ³	Virginia DMV and MVDB ⁴	Maryland DMV ⁵	Minnesota DPS ⁶	Arizona MVD ⁷
Number of days to process a fuel refund claim	Strategic Plan					
Number of days to process through initial entry	Strategic Plan					
Number of days to process non-electronic data (EDI) through initial entry	Strategic Plan					
Revenue						
Revenue generated (millions) before refunds	Budget					
Percentage of revenue received through electronic funds transfer (EFT)	Strategic Plan, Budget					
ALTERNATE SERVICE DELIVERY/SELF-SERVICE						
Number/volume of internet transactions		Strategic Plan		Budget		
Number of motor vehicle transactions processed in real time online					Budget	
Number/percent of transactions that were alternate or self-service (could include internet, mail, telecommunications/IVR, or other electronic means)			Virginia Results	Budget	Budget	Master List
Percent of driver license address changes made without visiting office		Annual Report				
Number of transactions available on-line/percent of information, services or transactions available on-line	Strategic Plan	Strategic Plan		Budget		
Percent of phone calls into the Financial Responsibility Call Center handled by the automated phone system		Strategic Plan				
Percent of driver license issuance transactions conducted via internet or mail		Strategic Plan				

**Review of Performance and Outcome Measures of the
Washington State Department of Licensing's Transportation-Related Programs
Summary of Oversight Measures Used by Survey Agencies**

Performance Measure/ Description	Where Reported, by Agency ¹					
	Missouri DOR ²	Tennessee DOS ³	Virginia DMV and MVDB ⁴	Maryland DMV ⁵	Minnesota DPS ⁶	Arizona MVD ⁷
CALL CENTER						
Percent of incoming calls answered/busy calls				Budget ⁸		
Percent of calls abandoned (or abandoned to operator)		Strategic Plan, Budget				
Percent of Call Center customers rating service as Good or Very Good				Budget		
Average telephone wait time (minutes)						Master List
Calls per FTE						
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY						
Percent of time network is available (uptime)	Strategic Plan					
Percentage of customers indicating satisfaction with web site	Strategic Plan					
Number of homepage hits (millions)	Strategic Plan					
Number of e-mails received	Strategic Plan					

⁸ Calls answered at the Customer Service Center

Appendix 3E
Missouri Department of Revenue
Oversight Measures

Missouri Department of Revenue
Division of Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing, Division of Tax (Fuel Only), Division of Administration (Selected IT Only)
OVERSIGHT MEASURES

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported? ¹	(3) Baseline Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target ²	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
DRIVERS							
Number of driver licenses produced (total, initial, non-driver)	Strategic Plan, Budget	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Budget	Louisiana, Iowa, Nevada	
Revenue generated (millions)	Strategic Plan, Budget	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Budget	Louisiana, Iowa, Nevada	
Department's cost to produce a drivers license (total and vendor document cost only)	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Budget	Louisiana, Iowa, Nevada	
Customer cost to obtain a license (Cost of time and fees a customer spends annually to obtain an initial drivers license)	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Budget	Louisiana, Iowa, Nevada	Outcome Measure: Decreased cost of compliance
Number of renewal licenses produced	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Budget	Louisiana, Iowa, Nevada	

¹ Fiscal Year 2005 Strategic Plan – Missouri Department of Revenue

² Product owners are directed to set stretch targets, where possible. "Budget" indicates that the targets are budget projections based on actual data. Targets and projections are developed in roundtable discussions at the product level and are reviewed and approved by the Division Director.

Missouri Department of Revenue
Division of Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing, Division of Tax (Fuel Only), Division of Administration (Selected IT Only)
OVERSIGHT MEASURES

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported? ¹	(3) Baseline Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target ²	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
Renewal revenue generated (millions)	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Budget	Louisiana, Iowa, Nevada	
Department's cost to produce a renewal license (total and vendor document cost only)	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999 (FY 2002 for vendor document cost)	Yes	Budget	Louisiana, Iowa, Nevada	
Customer cost to obtain renewal license	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Budget	Louisiana, Iowa, Nevada	
Percent of time driver license renewal notifications mailed on time.	Strategic Plan (Outcomes)						Outcome Measure: Increased Quality Performance
Percentage of driver licenses produced correctly on the first attempt	Budget						Outcome Measure: Increased Quality Performance
FIELD OFFICE CONTACT							
Number of field office transactions processed (motor vehicle and drivers license)	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Budget	Virginia, Oregon, Arizona	
Average wait time in minutes (motor vehicle and drivers license)	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Stretch	Virginia, Oregon, Arizona	

Missouri Department of Revenue
Division of Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing, Division of Tax (Fuel Only), Division of Administration (Selected IT Only)
OVERSIGHT MEASURES

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported? ¹	(3) Baseline Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target ²	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
Percentage of customers completing their transactions during first visit to a field office	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Stretch	Virginia, Oregon, Arizona	
MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION							
Number of motor vehicle registrations produced (millions)	Strategic Plan, Budget	Yes	Actual performance in FY 2002	Yes	Budget		
Percentage of registrations produced correctly on the first try	Strategic Plan, Budget	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Stretch	Minnesota, Kansas, Arkansas	Outcome Measure: Increased Quality Performance
Registration revenue generated (millions)	Strategic Plan, Budget	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Budget		
Cost to correct mistakes (thousands)	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	No			
Number of days to process one registration (Number of days to update registration information in the general registration system.)	Strategic Plan, Budget	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Stretch	Minnesota, Kansas, Arkansas	
Department's cost to produce motor vehicle registrations (millions)	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Budget		

Missouri Department of Revenue
Division of Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing, Division of Tax (Fuel Only), Division of Administration (Selected IT Only)
OVERSIGHT MEASURES

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported? ¹	(3) Baseline Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target ²	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
Department's cost to produce one motor vehicle registration	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Budget		
Cost to customers (time and money) to obtain/renew a registration	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Stretch		Outcome measure: Decreased cost of compliance
Total cost to customers of motor vehicle registration	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	No			
Percent of time motor vehicle and marine craft registration renewal notifications mailed on time.	Strategic Plan (Outcomes)						Outcome Measure: Increased Quality Performance
MOTOR VEHICLE TITLE							
Percentage of motor vehicle title transactions completed correctly	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 2003	Yes	Stretch		Outcome Measure: Increased Quality Performance
Number of titles produced (millions)	Strategic Plan, Budget	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Budget		
Percentage of titles produced correctly on the first try	Strategic Plan, Budget	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Stretch	Minnesota, Kansas, Arkansas	Outcome Measure: Increased Quality Performance

Missouri Department of Revenue
Division of Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing, Division of Tax (Fuel Only), Division of Administration (Selected IT Only)
OVERSIGHT MEASURES

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported? ¹	(3) Baseline Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target ²	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
Title revenue generated (millions)	Strategic Plan, Budget	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Budget		
Cost to correct mistakes (millions)	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	No			
Number of days to process a title (regular, quick, reject)	Strategic Plan, Budget	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999. No baseline for reject titles.	Yes	Stretch	Minnesota, Kansas, Arkansas	Outcome Measure: Increased Quality Performance
Department's cost to produce titles (millions)	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	No			
Cost to produce one title	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Stretch		
Customers cost (time and money) to obtain a title	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Stretch		Outcome measure: Decreased cost of compliance
Total cost to customers (millions)	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	No			
DEALER REGISTRATION							
Total revenue collected	Budget	Yes	Actual performance in FY 2004	Yes	Budget		

Missouri Department of Revenue
Division of Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing, Division of Tax (Fuel Only), Division of Administration (Selected IT Only)
OVERSIGHT MEASURES

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported? ¹	(3) Baseline Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target ²	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
Total number of dealerships licensed	Budget	Yes	Actual performance in FY 2004	Yes	Budget		
FUEL TAX³							
Revenue generated (millions), before refunds	Budget	Yes	Actual performance in FY 2004	Yes	Budget		
Number of days from receipt to deposit	Strategic Plan, Budget	Yes	Actual performance in FY 2004	Yes	Budget		
Number of returns filed	Strategic Plan, Budget	Yes	Actual performance in FY 2004	Yes	Budget		
Percentage of revenue received through electronic funds transfer (EFT)	Strategic Plan, Budget	Yes	Actual performance in FY 2004	Yes	Budget		
Number of telephone calls received	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 2003	Yes	?		
Percent of returns with errors	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 2003	Yes	?		
Number of days to process through initial entry	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 2003	Yes	?		

³ These measures are prepared by the Division of Tax, and were extracted from published sources. They were not confirmed through interviews.

Missouri Department of Revenue
Division of Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing, Division of Tax (Fuel Only), Division of Administration (Selected IT Only)
OVERSIGHT MEASURES

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported? ¹	(3) Baseline Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target ²	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
Number of days to process non-electronic data (EDI) through initial entry	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 2003	Yes	?		
Number of fuel refund claims processed	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 2003	Yes	?		
Number of days to process fuel refund claims	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 2003	Yes	?		
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY⁴							
Percent of time network is available (uptime)	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 2003	Yes	Stretch	Industry Standard	Measure applies to entire Department
Percentage of customers indicating satisfaction with web site	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 2001	Yes	Stretch		Measure applies to entire Department
Number of homepage hits (millions)	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Stretch		Measure applies to entire Department
Number of transactions available on-line	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 1999	Yes	Stretch		Measure applies to entire Department

⁴ These measures are prepared by the Division of Administration, and were extracted from published sources. They were not confirmed through interviews, nor are they intended to be all-inclusive.

Missouri Department of Revenue
Division of Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing, Division of Tax (Fuel Only), Division of Administration (Selected IT Only)
OVERSIGHT MEASURES

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported? ¹	(3) Baseline Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target ²	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
Number of e-mails received	Strategic Plan	Yes	Actual performance in FY 2001	Yes	Stretch		Measure applies to entire Department

Appendix 3F
Tennessee Department of Safety
Oversight Measures and Sample Operating Measures

**Tennessee Department of Safety
Driver License Issuance and Vehicle Services Divisions
OVERSIGHT MEASURES**

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported?	(3) Baseline Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
ADMINISTRATION⁵							
Number of services available by Internet	Strategic Plan ⁶	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s)	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	
Yearly volume of Internet service transactions	Strategic Plan	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s) and FY01-02 new proof of Insurance Law	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	
Percent of phone calls into the financial responsibility call center handled by the automated phone system	Strategic Plan	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s)	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	
DRIVER LICENSE ISSUANCE							
Percent of non-test applicants issued license within 15 minutes after examiner pulls the record	Strategic Plan, Budget ⁷ , Annual Report ⁸	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s) and passage of new legal presence law	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	Not a measure of wait time. Clock starts when customer reaches the counter.
Percent of driver license issuance transactions conducted via Internet, mail	Strategic Plan, Budget, Annual Report	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s) and new internet service projections	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	
Percent of non-test driver license field transactions	Strategic Plan	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s) and new	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison	

⁵ These measures are reported for entire Department of Public Safety (all programs)

⁶ Tennessee Department of Safety Agency Strategic Plan, Part 2 - Performance Measures, September 2004

⁷ State of Tennessee 2004-2005 Budget

⁸ Tennessee Department of Safety Annual Report Fiscal Year 2002-2003

**Tennessee Department of Safety
Driver License Issuance and Vehicle Services Divisions
OVERSIGHT MEASURES**

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported?	(3) Baseline Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
conducted at county clerk offices			county clerk partnership projections			at this time	
FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY							
Number of all offenses handled by Financial Responsibility	Annual Report	No		No		No formal comparison at this time	
Average number of days between the Department's receiving mandatory court convictions and mailing the letter revoking the Drivers License	Strategic Plan, Budget ⁹ , Annual Report	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s)	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	
Percent of Tennessee court records received electronically	Strategic Plan	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s), legislation, and current/projected number of courts with electronic submission capabilities	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS – DRIVER IMPROVEMENT							

⁹ State of Tennessee 2004-2005 Budget

**Tennessee Department of Safety
Driver License Issuance and Vehicle Services Divisions
OVERSIGHT MEASURES**

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported?	(3) Baseline Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
Percent of hearings held within 60 calendar days of points suspension letter	Annual Report	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s) and recent rule changes	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	
TITLING AND REGISTRATION							
Number of work units in which quality control has been implemented	Strategic Plan	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s) and analysis of internal processes	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	
Percent of titles issued locally by County Clerks	Strategic Plan, Budget	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s)	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	Proxy measure. Currently cannot adequately measure title transaction time. We do know turn around time is faster is title is issued by County Clerk
Percent of renewal registration errors	Strategic Plan, Budget, Annual Report	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s)	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	
Percent of abandoned calls to T&R telephone operators	Strategic Plan, Budget	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s)	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	
TECHNICAL SERVICES							
Percent of crash reports received electronically	Strategic Plan	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s) and projected number of THP, local law	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	

**Tennessee Department of Safety
Driver License Issuance and Vehicle Services Divisions
OVERSIGHT MEASURES**

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported?	(3) Baseline Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
			enforcement agencies with ability to process crash reports using laptops				

**Tennessee Department of Safety
Driver License Issuance and Vehicle Services Divisions
SAMPLE OPERATING MEASURES**

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported?	(3) Baseline Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
Number of internet services	PM Spreadsheet ¹⁰	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s)	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	
Volume of internet service transactions	PM Spreadsheet	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s)	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	
Average days to mail mandatory conviction letters	PM Spreadsheet	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s)	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	
Percent of hearings held within 60 days of points suspension letter	PM Spreadsheet	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s)	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	
Percent of titles issued locally by county clerks	PM Spreadsheet	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s)	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	
Percent abandoned calls to T&R operators	PM Spreadsheet	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s)	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	
Percent renewal registration errors	PM Spreadsheet	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s)	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	
Percent applicants not needing a test served "at the counter" within 15 minutes"	PM Spreadsheet	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s)	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	
Percent non-test transactions conducted outside the office	PM Spreadsheet	Yes	Data from previous fiscal year(s)	Yes	Budget	No formal comparison at this time	

¹⁰ The Tennessee DOS Motor Vehicle Performance Measure Spreadsheet for FY 03-04

Appendix 3G
Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles
and Virginia Motor Vehicle Dealer Board
Oversight Measures

**Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles
OVERSIGHT MEASURES**

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported?	(3) Baseline Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
VIRGINIA RESULTS							
Percent customer satisfaction and service effectiveness as measured by a customer survey (The rate or percentage of customers that are very satisfied or somewhat satisfied as compared to the total number of customers who respond)	Virginia Results ¹¹	Yes	Baseline is set at most recent survey result (previous year).	Yes	Stretch Desired level of service – measured annually	None	Provides an indicator of the quality of customer service. Survey is conducted annually by an independent entity. 100% = maximum satisfaction: a target value is based on the most recent fiscal year actual Satisfaction Survey results. Reported annually since 1996.
Cost per customer served (in dollars) (Annual fiscal year expenditures, compared to the number of annual customers)	Virginia Results	Yes	Cost baseline is set at \$3.50, based on tracking of overall management of operating expenses	Yes	Fixed (manage to baseline)	None	Since the preferred direction of this trend of results is to maintain the cost per customer served, the previous fiscal year CPCS is used as the current FY's target. Reported annually

¹¹ "Virginia Results Planning and Performance Report, May 2004", Virginia Department of Planning and Budget (web published)

**Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles
OVERSIGHT MEASURES**

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported?	(3) Baseline Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
							since 1996.
<p>Percentage of customers using mail service, telecommunications, and electronic means for processing and paying renewal transactions</p> <p>(The rate or percentage of transactions handled outside of Customer Service Centers as compared to total DMV renewal transactions.)</p>	Virginia Results	Yes	<p>Baseline is set at most recent level of performance.</p> <p>Monitor progress towards objective to shift customers away from face-to-face service, if possible.</p>	Yes	Stretch	None	<p>This measure monitors agency progress toward a stated objective to shift customers away from face-to-face service, if possible.</p> <p>The target is based on the average percentage of alternative transaction history for FY 97 – FY 00</p> <p>Reported annually since 1997.</p>
<p>Reduction in the number of highway fatalities related to alcohol use and lack of seatbelt use</p> <p>(This measure has tentatively been approved for the next reporting cycle.)</p>	Not yet reported (will be part of Virginia Results).	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

**Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles
OVERSIGHT MEASURES**

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported?	(3) Baseline Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
MANAGEMENT SCORECARD							
Human Resources Management (Workforce Planning, Employee Attractions & Retention, Fairness & Diversity, Employee Performance Management, Training & Development, Safe Work Environment)	Management Scorecard ¹²	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Government Procurement (eVA/State Purchasing Portal Usage, Small, Women & Minority Suppliers)	Management Scorecard	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Financial Management (Budget Plan, Internal Controls, APA Audits, Prompt Pay, Disbursement Policies)	Management Scorecard	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Technology (IT Planning, IT Investments, IT Project Management, Policy Adherence)	Management Scorecard	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

¹² Office of the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, "Virginia Excels", Governor's Management Scorecard (web published). Agencies are evaluated on the following scale: Meets Expectations, Progress Toward Expectations, Below Expectations in five categories.

**Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles
OVERSIGHT MEASURES**

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported?	(3) Baseline Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
Performance Management (Communicates Priorities)	Management Scorecard	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
OTHER OVERSIGHT							
Wait time (Average time from arrival at Customer Service Center to service at counter, per week)	Governor's Office	Yes	Benchmark set at 20 minutes.	Yes	Fixed (manage to baseline)	None	Data are from Q- Matic system. Governor receives this number in a weekly e-mail.

**Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles
OTHER/OPERATIONAL MEASURES**

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported?	(3) Baseline Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
Call center – time on hold (Other call center data are available and monitored)	Internal tracking	Yes	A 4 minute maximum has been established (call routing system takes a message and terminates call after 4 minutes)	Yes	Fixed (manage to baseline)	None	Call time data comes from the Call Management System. Time is reported in minutes and seconds.

**Virginia Motor Vehicle Dealer Board
OVERSIGHT MEASURES**

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported?	(3) Base- line Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
Percentage of customer e-mail assistance requests received by the Customer Assistance Division that are processed within five business days. (Percentage processed within specified timeframe from total number received.)	Virginia Results	Yes	Set at actual value for 2002. This is the minimum performance expectation established by the Executive Director and Board of Directors.	Yes	Same as Baseline		
Percentage of initial salesperson applicants denied a license. (Percentage of applicants denied a license from the total number of applicants processed)	Virginia Results	Yes	Previous year's performance result	Yes	Same as Baseline		Last year's percentage serves as next year's target. Objective is to maintain zero denials.
Number of new motor vehicle salespersons licensed by MVDB (in thousands) (Total number of successful applicants processed during the report period.)	Virginia Results	Yes	Previous year's performance result	Yes	Same as Baseline		
Number of customer assistance requests received regarding motor vehicle dealer operations (Total number of inquiries received within the report period.)	Virginia Results	Yes	Previous year's performance result	Yes	Same as Baseline		

**Virginia Motor Vehicle Dealer Board
OVERSIGHT MEASURES**

(1) Performance Measure/ Description	(2) Where Reported?	(3) Base- line Estab- lished?	(4) How was Baseline Created?	(5) Target Estab- lished?	(6) Type of Target	(7) Peer Agencies Compared With (If Any)	(8) Comments
Percentage of initial salesperson license applications processed within seven business days.	Virginia Results	Yes	Minimum performance expectation established by Executive Director and Board of Directors	Yes	Same as Baseline		

Appendix 3H
Washington Department of Licensing
Transportation-Related Oversight Measures

***Washington Department of Licensing
Transportation-related Performance Measures
Oversight Measures Classification Summary***

Introduction:

This document summarizes the primary oversight measures that are reported and/or used by the Department of Licensing to describe and manage transportation-related services.

Sources:

DOL's Oversight Measures were extracted from the following sources:

AAI = State of Washington Agency Activity Inventory for Agency 240: Department of Licensing (for the Appropriation Period 2005-07, Activity Version 2005-07 Carry Forward Level)

GOV = Performance Agreement between the Department of Licensing and the Governor of the State of Washington, July 2004 – June 2005.

Goals and Objectives Key:

Statewide Results Areas (from the Agency Activity Inventory)

I = Improve the safety of people and property

II = Improve the economic vitality of businesses and individuals

III = Improve the ability of State Government to achieve its results efficiently and effectively

Goals (from the DOL Strategic Plan)

A = Set new levels of excellence in customer service and satisfaction

B = Prevent physical injury and fatalities

C = Prevent crime and property loss

D = Collect revenue to support transportation, law enforcement, and mobility of goods and services

E = Help businesses thrive

Objectives (from the DOL Strategic Plan)

- 1 = Identify and license qualified drivers, vehicles, businesses and individuals practicing key professions.
- 2 = Ensure compliance with safety standards by conducting audits, investigations, background checks and inspections.
- 3 = Apply penalties when standards are not met. Restore privileges, such as reinstating licensure, when standards are achieved.
- 4 = Educate and share information with citizens.
- 5 = Collect and administer revenue.
- 6 = Administer activities effectively.

Key to Measure Classification (by Column):

- (1) Workload and/or Volume Measures: “W” indicates workload measure, “V” indicates volume measure, and “O” indicates other types of non-performance measures.
- (2) Revenue Generation & Budget Measures: “B” indicates budget measure and “RG” indicates revenue generation measure.
- (3) Customer Perspective Measures: “SA” indicates service attribute measure, “IR” indicates image and reputation measure, and “SO” indicates social outcome measure.
- (4) Process Perspective Measures: “C” indicates efficiency (cost/unit) measure, “Q” indicates effectiveness (quality) measure, and “T” indicates timeliness measure.
- (5) Learning and Growth Perspective Measures: “ED” indicates employee development measures, “TD” indicates technology development measures, and “CD” indicates cultural development measures.

WA Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Oversight Measures	Source	Section	Goal/ Objective	(1) Workload/ Volume Measures	(2) Revenue Generation & Budget Measures	(3) Customer Perspective Measures	(4) Process Perspective Measures	(5) Learning/ Growth Measures
Information technology (IT) policy development, implementation, security administration, privacy protection, and operational integrity of 149 IT applications linked to 95 data bases of 25 million client records with 238 electronic interfaces to individual citizen records.	AAI	SD	6	W				
Verification and update of driver records for 20,000 suspensions for DUI convictions annually.	AAI	DLS&R	B,C,2,3	W				
Verification and update of driver records for 69,000 DUI arrests annually.	AAI	DLS&R	B,C,2,3	W				
Verification and update of driver records for 993,000 citations annually.	AAI	DLS&R	A,1,2	W				
Verification and update of driver records for 30,000 uninsured accidents annually.	AAI	DLS&R	B,C,1,2,3	W				
Respond to 4,000 telephone calls and 200 emails weekly from citizens inquiring about their driving records.	AAI	DLS&R	A,4	W				
Registration of 3.2 million voters, partnering with the Secretary of State's Office.	AAI	ELC	III	W				
Registration of 747,000 organ donors, a best practice for other states.	AAI	ELC	III,6	W		SO		
Receive 2,400 allegations of suspected license fraud or identity theft annually.	AAI	PCE	I,C,D,4,6	W				
Receive, research and respond to 48,000 photo and informational requests, and 840 photomontages requests from law enforcement annually.	AAI	PCE	I,III, A,C,6	W				
1,200 hearings for habitual offenders who have accumulated multiple moving violations leading to increased civil penalties.	AAI	PDPD	I.2	W				
550 Financial Responsibility hearings for accidents without the required insurance.	AAI	PDPD	I,2,3	W				
Hearings to restrict the driving privileges of 170 drivers for medical reasons that impair their ability to safely operate a motor vehicle.	AAI	PDPD	I,B,2	W				
(Conduct) 60 fraud hearings.	AAI	PDPD	I,C,2,3	W				

WA Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Oversight Measures	Source	Section	Goal/ Objective	(1) Workload/ Volume Measures	(2) Revenue Generation & Budget Measures	(3) Customer Perspective Measures	(4) Process Perspective Measures	(5) Learning/ Growth Measures
Conduct 18,000 hearings (what kind?)	AAI	PDPD	I,C,2,3	W				
Registration and monitoring of 566 instructors and 162 driving schools and training sites annually to ensure that minimum curriculum requirements are met to properly educate and develop the driving skills of 64,000 new vehicle drivers.	AAI	PCOM	II,2,4	W				
22,500 knowledge tests and 7,000 motorcycle skill tests conducted annually.	AAI	PCOM	1	W				
Process 20,000 business tax returns annually.	AAI	AFX	D,5	W				
Process 52,000 licensing transactions for approximately 26,000 IRP registered vehicles annually.	AAI	AFX	1	W				
License 3,600 IFTA accounts.	AAI	AFX	1	W				
Conduct 400 field audits annually to ensure compliance and uniformity with prorate and fuel tax statutes.	AAI	AFX	D,2,5	W				
Process and issue 20,000 prorate and fuel tax refunds annually.	AAI	AFX	A,6	W				
Investigate over 2,000 customer and business complaints annually.	AAI	ARF	I,B,C,2	W				
Conduct 1,300 investigations and over 2,300 inspections, certifications and technical assistance visits to ensure compliance with the laws governing vehicle and vessel dealers and manufacturers.	AAI	ARF	I,B,2	W				
Conduct 359 audits of vehicle and vessel dealerships.	AAI	ARF	I,B,2	W				
Document and record approximately 6 million registrations, including 600,000 mandatory license plate replacements, two million certificates of ownership (titles) for motor vehicles, and title and register over 260,000 vessels annually.	AAI	AVV	6	W	RG			
Percent of code completed and ready for testing (Unisys re-platforming).	GOV		III,A,6	W				TD
Percent of requirements completed – National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVITIS).	GOV		II,A,6	W				TD
Number of tribal fuel tax agreements renegotiated.	GOV		II,D,5	W				
Number of Internet transactions performed.	GOV		III,A,6	W			C	TD

WA Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Oversight Measures	Source	Section	Goal/ Objective	(1) Workload/ Volume Measures	(2) Revenue Generation & Budget Measures	(3) Customer Perspective Measures	(4) Process Perspective Measures	(5) Learning/ Growth Measures
Collection of \$3 billion in transportation revenues each biennium.	AAI	SD	D,5		RG			
Accounting services for the collection, sourcing and distribution of \$1.5 billion of state and local revenues annually.	AAI	SD	D,5		RG			
Collection of \$45.8 million in revenue annually from issuance of driver licenses and identification cards.	AAI	ELC	D,5		RG			
Collection of \$468,000 in revenue annually from Commercial Driver Schools.	AAI	ELC	D,5		RG			
Collect in excess of \$1.3 million in revenue.	AAI	PDPD	D,5		RG			
Collect approximately \$1.9 billion in fuel taxes per biennium.	AAI	AFX	D,5		RG			
Collect \$43.8 million in Washington commercial vehicle registration fees	AAI	AFX	D,5		RG			
Collect and transmit \$12 million to other IRP jurisdictions.	AAI	AFX	D,5		RG			
Recover over \$4 million each biennium in unpaid taxes.	AAI	AFX	D,5		RG			
Collect \$4.4 million in revenue from dealer license fees per biennium.	AAI	ARF	D,5		RG			
Generate \$9.2 million in combination of revenue for state and recovered/returned money to customers during the biennium.	AAI	ARF	II,A,D,5		RG			
Collect fines in excess of \$600,000 for violations charged during the biennium.	AAI	ARF	I,D,3,5		RG			
Collect \$708 million for the Motor Vehicle fund.	AAI	AVV	D,5		RG			
Collect \$33.4 million for the General Fund from vessel registration.	AAI	AVV	D,5		RG			
Collect \$125.3 million in vehicle excise taxes.	AAI	AVV	D,5		RG			
Collect \$74.3 million for the Monorail project.	AAI	AVV	D,5		RG			
Collect \$328 million for the Department of Revenue in use tax.	AAI	AVV	D,5		RG			
Sell 82,000 (original and renewal) personalized plates annually.	AAI	AVV	D,5		RG			
Issue 108,000 license plates with special designations for universities, Law Enforcement Memorial and others, collecting and depositing the funds for identified organizations.	AAI	AVV	D,5		RG			

WA Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Oversight Measures	Source	Section	Goal/ Objective	(1) Workload/ Volume Measures	(2) Revenue Generation & Budget Measures	(3) Customer Perspective Measures	(4) Process Perspective Measures	(5) Learning/ Growth Measures
Reduction in vehicle fatalities.	AAI	DLS&R	B,1,2,3			SO		
Reduction in the NHTSA fatality rate per 100 million vehicle miles traveled.	AAI	ELC	I,B			SO		
Reduce the number of truck-related fatalities by 41 percent by 2008	AAI	ELC	I,B			SO		
Improve the percentage of suspects apprehended for identity crimes.	AAI	PCE	I,II,C,4,6			SO	Q	
Wait time for citizens seeking services in licensing offices of under 20 minutes (on average)	AAI	ELC	III,A,6			SA		
Reduce financial loss to small businesses due to drivers license fraud.	AAI	PCE	I,C,D,4,6			SA		
Prove online access and customer services 24 hours a day, offering 41 forms online.	AAI	ARF	A,4			SA		
Provide a wide variety of online services through Internet Payment Option services, enabling 24/7 customer convenience, with over 420,000 online vehicle and vessel renewals processed in a 12 month period.	AAI	AVV	III,A,6			SA		TD
Enable 7,700 Internet users per month to access forms online.	AAI	AVV	III,A,6			SA		
Reduction in the number of busy calls (call center).	GOV		III,A,6			SA		
Reduction in the number of abandoned calls (call center).	GOV		III,A,6			SA		
Percent increase in the number of Internet transactions.	GOV		III,A,6			SA	Q	
15,700 DUI hearings which must be processed within 60 days.	AAI	PDPD	I,2				T	
Conduct a DUI hearing within 60 days of the incident.	AAI	PDPD	I,B,C,3				T	
Reduce the paperwork burdens for fuel tax licensing, reporting, and payment of fuel taxes for interstate motor carriers.	AAI	AFX	II,A,E,6				Q	
Reduction of administrative DUI sanctions dismissals to 25% or less.	GOV		I,C,3				Q	
Percent of transactions processed by the NMVITIS.	GOV		III,A,6				Q	
Utilization of hearings officers statewide.	GOV		III,B,3				C	
Reduction in the manual processing of motor carrier forms (target = 70%).	GOV		III,6				C	
Calls per FTE (call center).	GOV		III,6				C	
Self-serve calls (call center).	GOV		III,A,6				C	

WA Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Oversight Measures	Source	Section	Goal/ Objective	(1) Workload/ Volume Measures	(2) Revenue Generation & Budget Measures	(3) Customer Perspective Measures	(4) Process Perspective Measures	(5) Learning/ Growth Measures
Human resources services for 1,224 employees, including employee development and training (10,000 hours).	AAI	SD	6					ED, CD
Number of participants completing Leadership 1 Training.	GOV		III					ED
Progress in preparing Leadership 2 Training curriculum.	GOV		III					ED